



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which was promptly besieged by the Persians. After some time the city's supply of water ran low. In their distress the people began to consider surrendering to their foes. At this crisis the goddess came and stood over the head of one of the rulers of the city as he lay asleep and exhorted him to be of good cheer, as she would beg from her father the water they needed so urgently. Then he that had seen the vision told his fellow-citizens the behest of Athena. They made examination of their supply and found only enough water on hand to last them five days. Accordingly, they asked the Persians to grant them a truce for this length of time, declaring that Athena had sent to her father for aid and that, if it did not appear by the appointed time, they would surrender their city. When Datis, the admiral of Darius, was told of this request, he laughed heartily; but when, on the following day, a great darkness gathered about the acropolis and a heavy shower of rain descended into its midst, the besieged unexpectedly found themselves possessed of an abundance of water, while it was now the Persian host that began to feel the want of it. Then great fear fell upon the Persian commander at the manifestation of the goddess. He took off his robe, his twisted collar, and his armlets, the ornaments of his person, and sent them as offerings to the goddess, adding also his tiara, his sword and even his carriage. All these gifts were formerly safely preserved, but they were burnt up together with most of the other offerings in the fire that destroyed the temple in the year when Eucles, son of Astyanaktidas, was priest of Helios. Datis now withdrew from the siege and friendly relations were established with the people whom he had besieged, of whom he said, "These men are in the protection of the gods".

From these excerpts it will be clear that, while possessing little or no literary merit in itself, this product of Hellenistic research is of considerable value for the history of later Greek literature. Not only does it definitely date Timachidas and help towards a nearer dating of several other historians, but also something of the nature of the lost works of the men who are quoted can be guessed from the facts for which they are the authorities. For instance, it may safely be deduced that Xenagoras belongs to the same imaginative and romantic school of history as Plutarch's notorious authority, Phanias of Lesbos. In short, it is a thoroughly Hellenistic document, filled with interest for all students of Greek literature, language, mythology, religion, history, art or almost any branch of philology. It is unfortunate that the text has not yet appeared in accessible form.

In conclusion may be mentioned an epigram of Aristides⁸, the rhetorician of the second century A. D., and two epigrams of the Athenian poet Antiphon of the same century⁹. These are not quotations, but, in the one case, an addition to the known works of Aristides, in the other the only works that have come down to us. Antiphon is known as a poet and actor of New Comedy. Until these epigrams were discovered recently, he was a mere name. Now, thanks to Wilhelm, he becomes something of a literary figure.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

KENDALL K. SMITH.

⁸Athenische Mittheilungen 29 (1904), 254-339.

⁹Jahreshefte des Oesterreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien 3 (1900), 93-98.

REVIEWS

The Acharnians of Aristophanes. Edited, from the MSS and other original Sources, by Richard Thomas Elliott. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1914). Pp. xliii + 241. \$4.75.

Pending the completion and publication of Professor J. W. White's complete edition of the scholia and text of Aristophanes, Greek scholars have good reason to welcome a critical edition of even one play in which the editor offers a text established by his first-hand collation of all the MSS and other sources available.

In the Introduction Mr. Elliott examines the relation and value of 14 MSS of the Acharnians, which he designates in accordance with the nomenclature adopted by Professor White (*The Manuscripts of Aristophanes*, *Classical Philology* 1.1-20), and states in detail his reasons for agreement with or dissent from other students of the MSS. In addition he makes careful use, for lines 593-975, of the fragments in the Hermupolis papyrus, which he reprints (*Excursus II*). The additional evidence obtained from this source shows, he claims, no decided agreement of any one of the MSS with the papyrus, though the coincidences with R (which he attributes to the tenth rather than to the eleventh century) are the most frequent.

The editor points out (*Introduction*, xiii) that "this is the only edition of a play of Aristophanes in which an editor has made verbatim collations of so many manuscripts". He adds: "Of the Acharnians no previous editor has made a full collation of even one manuscript from the original".

Mr. Elliott lays much stress also on the value of the citations of Athenaeus which, in so far as we have them, carry back the Aristophanes tradition some eight centuries further than the oldest extant MS of the Acharnians. The nature, amount, and worth of these citations the editor details in *Excursus I* (pages 181-201); Athenaeus's Text of Aristophanes. Incidentally he here discusses the relative value of quotations from and references to the text in other writers, Suidas, Didymus, etc.

Although he has carefully sifted the scholia he has been able to gain less from this source, as "no satisfactory edition of the scholia of this play¹ has hitherto been published".

There is appended a long excursus (207-241) on The Greek Dialects in Aristophanes. This part is of general interest. In it the editor discusses the Megarian, Boeotian, Laconian, and Ionic matter in Aristophanes, going beyond the limit of his own play, especially in the case of the Laconian dialect. His judgment in regard to some forms differs from that of other scholars, but, in the absence of monumental collections from the other dialects comparable to H. W. Smyth's *Greek Dialects* (Ionic), the questions which arise are perplexing. Mr. Elliott faces the problems frankly—the con-

¹Professor J. W. White has thus far edited and published the scholia for the Aves only.

tribution of inscriptions; the possible ignorance and the probable nonchalance of Aristophanes in the introduction of dialectic matter; the still undigested MS tradition; the variant orthography, etc. He draws several conclusions. The first he states as follows (page 222):

Aristophanes represented the Megarian dialect correctly as a rule, but has been guilty of not a few incorrect forms, chiefly for metrical purposes, but partly apparently through ignorance When he had to choose between a Megarian form and a joke, he chose the latter.

(2) His treatment of the Boeotian dialect, Mr. Elliott thinks (231), "is decidedly less accurate than his treatment of the Megarian". (3) Judging mainly from the *Lysistrata*, Mr. Elliott concludes (240) that "Aristophanes was more careful in regard to the Laconian dialect than to the Megarian, and much more than to the Boeotian in the *Acharnians*".

A comparison of the readings in the editions of Dindorf (1847) and of Starkie (1909) with those offered by Mr. Elliott in the long Megarian scene (*Ach.* 729-835) may serve to illustrate the textual betterment or change. Aside from some more or less obvious changes in punctuation, accent, speakers, etc., there are for these lines in Mr. Elliott's text 20 divergences from Dindorf's. Of these changes, however, 15 are identical with those already made or accepted by Starkie. But Starkie has 18 other divergences where Elliott's text reverts to that of Dindorf. In addition, it may be observed, more than half of Elliott's changes from Dindorf's text, in the lines in question, have to do with the supposed Megarian words, and, therefore, if these 100 odd lines represent roughly his conclusions for the whole text, we find that the editor's searching scrutiny of the textual evidence results, for him, in a tendency to revert largely to the long established text.

The proof reading is accurate.

Supplementing the Introduction, where he states his general conclusions and the method of his selection among the readings given in the (Latin) critical footnotes, Mr. Elliott appends copious notes in English at the end of the text (126-180).

To dissent off-hand from Mr. Elliott's selections of readings must presuppose at least an equal knowledge of the elements contributory to establishing a sound text of Aristophanes, and specialists differ as to the precedence to be accorded to certain MSS. But, in any case, Greek scholars must be grateful to the editor for his unsparing labor in obtaining and reviewing his data. In metrical matters, as is perhaps natural, he is somewhat impatient of "hypothesis" as against MS authority. Thus, in *Ach.* 47, he retains (with Starkie) in a trimeter the tabooed combination $\circ\circ\circ\circ$ (but see J. W. White: *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, 49). No one, however, can charge him with a tendency to suppress any of the steps by which he arrives at a given conclusion, and it would be ungracious to complain of his occasional naïveté in assuming that certain philological and

epigraphical phenomena, long since recognized, may be novel to readers otherwise competent to profit by his thoroughgoing and admirable analysis of perplexing and conflicting data.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

Caesar: *Gallic War*, Books I and II. Edited, with Notes, Summary of Forms and Syntax, Prose Composition, and Vocabulary, by Ernst Riess and Arthur L. Janes. Combined with Janes's *Sight Reading*. New York: American Book Company (1914). Pages 305 + 238 + 56. 12 maps, 50 illustrations. \$1.20.

By combining Books I and II of the *Gallic War* with Janes's *Sight Reading*, already published, this volume aims to meet the special requirements of the New York State Department of Education, and, by adding composition and grammatical material, to furnish a complete text-book for second year Latin. The book has nearly double the usual quantitative requirement of text for this year, which is the equivalent of the first four books of the *Gallic War*, about 80 full pages. We find here the 48 full pages of Books I and II, 52 pages of selections from Books III-VII, 29 from the *Civil War*, and 27 from *Nepos*; there is, therefore, abundant opportunity for the exercise of individual preference. The Grammatical Summary includes 33 pages of forms and 31 of syntax, to which is added a list of words in Books I and II that occur over five times in Caesar, listed under the chapter where they first occur. The Composition Exercises are based on B. G. I-II and give a connected narrative of the campaigns, but there is no reference to special chapters, and constructions are taken up systematically. The sentences for translation, all of which are recommended for oral rather than for written work, are quite short, and for the most part admirably suited to their purpose. The selections for sight reading have been judiciously made and carefully annotated. Besides the two Vocabularies there is a page and a half discussion of word formation, and a 16 page index of Proper Names to cover the sight reading.

In the Preface the editors say that, in annotating the two books of the *Gallic War*, they "have regarded their practical experience in the classroom as their safest guide", and not only these notes, but also the statements in the Grammatical Summary show many indications of the work of experienced teachers, who have not hesitated to think things out for themselves. In spite of these excellences, however, the book is badly marred by many careless or inaccurate statements. The reviewer has noted over one hundred passages in the notes on the first two books and in the Grammatical Summary which, in his opinion, will require some change when the book is revised. Only a few of these can here be given.

It is said in the Introduction (page 24) that the *pilum* "could be fetched back, in case of a miss, by means of a leather strap fastened to its end". This statement appears to have no adequate authority, and the method